

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,808	03/26/2001	Jason McCartney	MS1-784US	8368
22801	7590	08/26/2004	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC			SHIN, KYUNG H	
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500				
SPOKANE, WA 99201			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2143	

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

103

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/817,808	MCCARTNEY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kyung H Shin	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2001.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-76 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-76 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 March 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responding to application papers filed 3/26/2001.
2. Claims **1-76** are pending. Claims **1, 8, 9, 10, 19, 27, 29, 35, 36, 39, 47, 48, 51, 56, 61, 63, 66, 69, 72, 74** are **independent** claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 1-28, 39-50, 56-71** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over **Meyer** (US Patent No. 2001/0031066: Connected audio and other media objects, filed on 1/24/2001)

Regarding Claim 1, Meyer discloses A method of processing media content comprising:

receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user; (see paragraph 07, lines 4-8)

mapping the physical ID to a logical ID; (see paragraph 018, lines 5-9) and searching a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query. (see paragraph 07, lines 12-15)

Regarding Claim 2, Meyer discloses The method of claim 1 further comprising returning the metadata to a client. (see paragraph 07, lines 12-15)

Regarding Claim 3, Meyer discloses The method of claim 1 further comprising formatting the metadata in a schema and returning the formatted metadata to a client. (see paragraph 019, lines 3-5)

Regarding Claim 4, Meyer discloses The method of claim 1 further comprising formatting the metadata in a XML schema and returning the formatted metadata to a client. (see paragraph 027, lines 11-19)

Regarding Claim 5, Meyer discloses The method of claim 1, wherein the specific media comprises a CD. (see paragraph 013, lines 8-12)

Regarding Claim 6, Meyer discloses The method of claim 1, wherein the specific media comprises a DVD. (see paragraph 013, lines 8-12)

Regarding Claim 7, Meyer discloses One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to implement the method of claim 1. (see paragraph 07, lines 12-15)

Regarding Claim 8, Meyer discloses A server comprising:

one or more processors; (see paragraph 0105, lines 1-5)

one or more storage devices; (see paragraph 0108, lines 1-5) and

software code resident on the one or more storage devices which, when

executed by the one or more processors, cause the processors to:

receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user; (see paragraph 07, lines 4-8)

map the physical ID to a logical ID; (see paragraph 018, lines 5-9)

search a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query; (see paragraph 07, lines

12-15)

format the metadata in a XML schema; (see paragraph 027, lines 11-19) and

return the formatted metadata to a client. (see paragraph 019, lines 3-5)

Regarding Claim 9, Meyer discloses One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to:

receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user; (see paragraph 07, lines 4-8)

map the physical ID to a logical ID; (see paragraph 018, lines 5-9)

search a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query; (see paragraph 07, lines 12-15)

format the metadata in a XML schema; (see paragraph 027, lines 11-19)

and

return the formatted metadata to a client. (see paragraph 019, lines 3-5)

Regarding Claim 10, Meyer discloses A method of processing media content comprising:

associating a physical ID with a logical ID, the physical ID corresponding to a specific media associated with content that can be experienced by a user; (see paragraph 07, lines 4-8)

using the logical ID to query one or more databases that contain metadata associated with the specific media; (see paragraph 07, lines 12-15) and

returning metadata associated with the specific media to a client. (see paragraph 07, lines 12-15)

Regarding Claim 11, Meyer discloses The method of claim 10, wherein said returning comprises returning the metadata via the Internet. (see paragraph 07, lines 12-15; paragraph 017, lines 2-4)

Regarding Claim 12, Meyer discloses The method of claim 10, wherein said returning comprises formatting the metadata in a schema and returning the formatted metadata to the client. (see paragraph 019, lines 3-5)

Regarding Claim 13, Meyer discloses The method of claim 10, wherein said returning comprises formatting the metadata in a XML schema and returning the formatted metadata to the client. (see paragraph 027, lines 11-19)

Regarding Claim 14, Meyer discloses The method of claim 10, wherein the specific media comprises a CD. (see paragraph 013, lines 8-12)

Regarding Claim 15, Meyer discloses The method of claim 10, wherein the specific media comprises a DVD. (see paragraph 013, lines 8-12)

Regarding Claim 16, Meyer discloses The method of claim 10, wherein the specific media comprises a file. (see paragraph 028, lines 2-5)

Regarding Claim 17, Meyer discloses One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a

computer, cause the computer to implement the method of claim 10. (see paragraph 07, lines 12-15)

Regarding Claim 18, Meyer discloses A server computer programmed with instructions which, when executed by the server computer, cause it to implement the method of claim 10. (see paragraph 07, lines 12-15)

Regarding Claim 19, Meyer discloses A method of processing media content comprising:

receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media associated with content that can be experienced by a user; (see paragraph 07, lines 4-8)
attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID; (see paragraph 018, lines 5-9)

if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query; (see paragraph 07, lines 12-15)

if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID. (see paragraph 018, lines 5-9)

Regarding Claim 20, Meyer discloses The method of claim 19, wherein said attempting comprises causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific

media can be collected from the user. (see paragraph 07, lines 15-28; paragraph 031, lines 12-16)

Regarding Claim 21, Meyer discloses The method of claim 19, wherein said attempting comprises attempting to identify the specific media to ascertain whether a logical ID already exists for the specific media. (see paragraph 07, lines 12-15)

Regarding Claim 22, Meyer discloses The method of claim 1.9 further comprising if said attempting is unsuccessful, enabling the user to establish a physical ID-to-logical ID mapping for their physical ID. (see paragraph 018, lines 5-9)

Regarding Claim 23, Meyer discloses The method of claim 19, wherein said specific media comprises a CD. (see paragraph 013, lines 8-12)

Regarding Claim 24, Meyer discloses The method of claim 19, wherein said specific media comprises a DVD. (see paragraph 013, lines 8-12)

Regarding Claim 25, Meyer discloses The method of claim 19, wherein said specific media comprises a file. (see paragraph 028, lines 2-5)

Regarding Claim 26, Meyer discloses One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to implement the method of claim 19. (see paragraph 07, lines 12-15)

Regarding Claim 27, Meyer discloses A server computer comprising:

one or more processors; (see paragraph 0105, lines 1-5)

one or more storage devices; (see paragraph 0108, lines 1-5) and

software code resident on the one or more storage devices which, when

executed by the one or more processors, cause the processors to:

receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user; (see paragraph 07, lines 4-8)

attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID; (see paragraph 018, lines 5-9)

if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, search a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical

ID as a basis for a search query; (see paragraph 07, lines 12-15) and

if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to

establish a logical ID for the physical ID. (see paragraph 018, lines 5-9)

Regarding Claim 28, Meyer discloses The server computer of claim 27, wherein the software code causes the processors to attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media

can be collected from the user. (see paragraph 07, lines 12-15; paragraph 031, lines 12-16)

Regarding Claim 39, Meyer discloses A method of processing media content comprising:

receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user; (see paragraph 07, lines 4-8)

attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID, the logical ID serving as a basis for a search query of a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media; (see paragraph 018, lines 5-9; paragraph 07, lines 12-15) if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempting to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user. (see paragraph 031, lines 12-16)

Regarding Claim 40, Meyer discloses The method of claim 3.9 further comprising receiving information from the user, via the Wizard UI, the information pertaining to the user's specific media. (see paragraph 031, lines 12-16)

Regarding Claim 41, Meyer discloses The method of claim 39, wherein the specific media comprises a CD, and the information collected by the Wizard UI: comprises an artist's name. (see paragraph 018, lines 3-5)

Regarding Claim 42, Meyer discloses The method of claim 39, wherein the specific media comprises a CD, and the information collected by the Wizard UI comprises a CD title. (see paragraph 018, lines 3-5)

Regarding Claim 43, Meyer discloses The method of claim 39, wherein the specific media comprises a DVD. (see paragraph 013, lines 8-12)

Regarding Claim 44, Meyer discloses The method of claim 39 further comprising searching for specific media based on the information collected by the Wizard UI. (see paragraph 07, lines 12-15; paragraph 031, lines 12-16)

Regarding Claim 45, Meyer discloses The method of claim 44 further comprising forming an association between the received physical ID and a logical ID if said searching finds media that coincides with the user's information. (see paragraph 018, lines 5-9)

Regarding Claim 46, Meyer discloses The method of claim 44 further comprising if said searching is unsuccessful, prompting the user to enter media-

specific information so that an association can be established between the media and a logical ID. (see paragraph 07, lines 15-18; paragraph 031, lines 12-16)

Regarding Claim 47, Meyer discloses One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to:

receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user; (see paragraph 07, lines 4-8)
attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID, the logical ID serving as a basis for a search query of a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media; (see paragraph 018, lines 5-9; paragraph 07, lines 12-15)
if no logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, attempt to establish a logical ID for the physical ID by causing a Wizard user interface (UI) to be presented to a user via a client computer so that information pertaining to the user's specific media can be collected from the user. (see paragraph 018, lines 5-9; paragraph 031, lines 12-16)

Regarding Claim 48, Meyer discloses A system for providing metadata to clients comprising:

a server configured to receive physical IDs that correspond to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user; (see paragraph 07, lines 4-8)

one or more databases containing metadata associated with various media;

(see paragraph 07, lines 12-15) and

at least one table containing physical IDs and associated logical IDs to which the physical IDs are mapped, the logical IDs being configured for use by the server in searching the one or more databases for metadata associated with specific media. (see paragraph 07, lines 12-15)

Regarding Claim 49, Meyer discloses The system of claim 48, wherein the server is configured to format metadata in a schema and return the formatted metadata to a client. (see paragraph 019, lines 3-5)

Regarding Claim 50, Meyer discloses The system of claim 48, wherein the server is configured to format metadata in a XML schema and return the formatted metadata to a client. (see paragraph 027, lines 11-19)

Regarding Claim 56, Meyer discloses A method of processing media content comprising:

receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific CD upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user; (see paragraph 07, lines 4-8)

mapping the physical ID to a logical ID; (see paragraph 018, lines 5-9)

searching a database that contains metadata associated with the CD by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query; (see paragraph 07, lines 12-15)

formatting the metadata in a XML schema; (see paragraph 027, lines 11-19)

and

returning the formatted metadata to a client. (see paragraph 027, lines 11-19)

Regarding Claim 57, Meyer discloses The method of claim 56, wherein the, XML schema comprises tags associated with one or more of: a CD name, author, release date, genre, style, rating and label. (see paragraph 015, lines 16-18)

Regarding Claim 58, Meyer discloses The method of claim 56, wherein the XML schema comprises at least one tag associated with a URL associated with data pertaining to the CD. (see paragraph 014, lines 11-16)

Regarding Claim 59, Meyer discloses The method of claim 56, wherein the XML schema comprises at least one tag associated with a URL associated with data pertaining to cover art for the CD. (see paragraph 015, lines 16-18)

Regarding Claim 60, Meyer discloses The method of claim 56, wherein the XML schema comprises at least one tag associated with a URL associated with data pertaining to a purchasing experience. (see paragraph 034, lines 10-14)

Regarding Claim 61, Meyer discloses A method of processing media content comprising:

receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific DVD upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user; (see paragraph 07, lines 4-8; paragraph 013, lines 8-12)

mapping the physical ID to a logical ID; (see paragraph 07, lines 12-15)

searching a database that contains metadata associated with the DVD by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query; (see paragraph 027, lines 11-19)

formatting the metadata in a XML schema; (see paragraph 027, lines 11-19)

and

returning the formatted metadata to a client. (see paragraph 027, lines 11-19)

Regarding Claim 62, Meyer discloses The method of claim 61, wherein the XML schema comprises tags associated with one or more of: a title, studio, lead performer, director, rating, and genre. (see paragraph 028, lines 12-16)

Regarding Claim 63, Meyer discloses An XML schema comprising:

a name tag associated with a CD name; an author tag associated with a CD author; (see paragraph 015, lines 16-18)

a track tag associated with a CD track; (see paragraph 012, lines 1-5)

at least one URL tag referencing a link to additional information pertaining to the CD; (see paragraph 014, lines 11-16) and

the schema being configured for use in sending metadata associated with a CD to client computer for display for a user. (see paragraph 027, lines 11-19)

Regarding Claim 64, Meyer discloses The XML schema of claim 63, wherein said link comprises a purchasing link to enable a user to make purchases associated with the CD via a network. (see paragraph 034, lines 10-14)

Regarding Claim 65, Meyer discloses The XML schema of claim 63, wherein said link comprises a cover art link to enable a user to obtain cover art associated with the CD via a network. (see paragraph 015, lines 16-18)

Regarding Claim 66, Meyer discloses An XML schema comprising:

a title tag associated with a title of a movie embodied on a DVD; (see paragraph 028, lines 12-16) and
at least one URL tag referencing a link to additional information pertaining to the DVD. (see paragraph 014, lines 11-16)

Regarding Claim 67, Meyer discloses The XML schema of claim 66, wherein said link comprises an art link to enable a user to obtain art associated with the DVD via a network. (see paragraph 015, lines 16-18)

Regarding Claim 68, Meyer discloses The XML schema of claim 66, wherein said link comprises a purchase link to enable a user to make purchases associated with the DVD via a network. (see paragraph 034, lines 10-14)

Regarding Claim 69, Meyer discloses A method of processing media content comprising:

generating a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user on a client computer;

(see paragraph 07, lines 4-8)

sending the physical ID to a server configured to return metadata

associated with the specific media; (see paragraph 07, lines 12-15)

receiving, from the server, XML-formatted metadata; (see paragraph 027, lines 11-19)

parsing, with the client computer, the XML-formatted metadata; (see

paragraph 027, lines 11-19) and

displaying the metadata for the user on the client computer. (see paragraph 0113, lines 1-3)

Regarding Claim 70, Meyer discloses The method of claim 69, wherein the specific media comprises a CD. (see paragraph 013, lines 8-12)

Regarding Claim 71, Meyer discloses The method of claim 69, wherein the specific media comprises a DVD. (see paragraph 013, lines 8-12)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 29-36, 51-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Jaeger** (US Patent No. 6,553,379: Address data storage device)

Regarding Claim 29, Jaeger discloses a method of processing media content comprising:

receiving a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user; attempting to map the physical ID to a logical ID by searching a first table containing physical ID-to-logical ID mappings using a first search; (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: search a physical ID-logical ID table, first table)
if the first search is unsuccessful, searching a second table containing physical ID-to-logical ID mappings using a second search; if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, searching a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query. (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: search a physical ID-logical ID table, second table)

Wherein Jaeger's physical ID-logical ID table is a table equivalent to Applicant's physical ID to logical ID mapping table. (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56) Jaeger's description of lists and data records is equivalent to applicant's description of the information contained in the physical ID to logical ID mapping table (reference's list) and the indicated information media content metadata (reference's data record) retrieved from the database.) Jaeger does disclose that the lists are tables that map a logical ID to a physical ID and data records stored in a storage means (i.e. database). Jaeger does disclose describing a physical ID and logical ID table, which is created by the usage of standard database table creation statements with table column/row names.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Jaeger's teachings of describing table name and its columns/rows as taught in Jaeger. One would have been motivated because the teachings are devoted to relational database application and the combination would have enabled Jaeger's system to utilize Entity-Relation model for establishing business and industrial application database models.

Regarding Claim 30, Jaeger discloses The method of claim 29, wherein the first table is a trusted table. (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: search a physical ID-logical ID table, first table) Referring to claim 30, claim 30 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of the claim 29.

Therefore, claim 30 is rejected for the same reason and motivation as the claim 29.

Regarding Claim 31, Jaeger discloses The method of claim 29, wherein the first table is a trusted table and the second table is less trusted than the first table. (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: search physical ID-logical ID table, first and second table) Referring to claim 31, claim 31 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of the claim 29. Therefore, claim 31 is rejected for the same reason and motivation as the claim 29.

Regarding Claim 32, Jaeger discloses The method of claim 29, wherein the second table contains user provided physical ID-to-logical ID mappings. (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: search a physical ID-logical ID table, second table) Referring to claim 32, claim 32 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of the claim 29. Therefore, claim 32 is rejected for the same reason and motivation as the claim 29.

Regarding Claim 33, Jaeger discloses The method of claim 29, wherein the first search comprises a low cost search, and further comprising if no logical ID is found for the physical ID, searching the first table using a third search, the third search comprising a higher cost search than the first search. (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: search a physical ID-logical ID table, first table) Referring to claim 33, claim 33 encompasses the same scope of the invention as

Art Unit: 2143

that of the claim 29. Therefore, claim 33 is rejected for the same reason and motivation as the claim 29.

Regarding Claim 34, Jaeger discloses One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to implement the method of claim 29. (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: search physical ID-logical ID tables)

Referring to claim 34, claim 34 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of the claim 29. Therefore, claim 34 is rejected for the same reason and motivation as the claim 29.

Regarding Claim 35, Jaeger discloses One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to:

receive a physical ID that corresponds to a specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by a user; attempt to map the physical ID to a logical ID by searching a first table containing physical ID-to-logical ID mappings using a first search, the first search comprising a low cost search; (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: search a physical ID-logical ID table, first table)

if the first search is unsuccessful, search a second table containing physical ID-to-logical ID mappings using a second search; (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: search a physical ID-logical ID table, second table)

if the second search is unsuccessful, search the first table using a third search, the third search comprising a higher cost search than the first search; and if a logical ID is found that corresponds to the physical ID, search a database that contains metadata associated with the specific media by using the logical ID as a basis for a search query. (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: search a physical ID-logical ID table, first table)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Jaeger's teachings of describing table name and its columns/rows as taught in Jaeger. One would have been motivated because the teachings are devoted to relational database application and the combination would have enabled Jaeger's system to utilize Entity-Relation model for establishing business and industrial application database models.

Regarding Claim 36, Jaeger discloses A method of processing media content comprising:

providing a canonical table containing physical ID to logical ID mappings, the physical IDs being associated with specific media containing content that can be experienced by a user, the logical IDs being configured for use in database queries to locate metadata associated with specific media; providing a table containing user-provided physical ID to logical ID mappings; receiving a physical ID associated with a specific media; (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: physical ID mapped to logical ID table)

conducting a first low cost search of the canonical table to determine whether there is a matching physical ID with a corresponding logical ID; (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: search a physical ID-logical ID table, first table)

if the first low cost search is unsuccessful, conducting a second low cost search of the table containing the user-provided physical ID to logical ID mappings to determine whether there is a matching physical ID with a corresponding logical ID; (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: search a physical ID-logical ID table, first table)

if the second low cost search is unsuccessful, conducting a third higher cost search of the canonical table to determine whether there is a matching physical ID with a corresponding logical ID; and if any of the searches are successful, using the corresponding logical ID to search a database containing metadata associated with the specific media. (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: search a physical ID-logical ID table, first table) Referring to claim 36, claim 36 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of the claim 29. Therefore, claim 36 is rejected for the same reason and motivation as the claim 29.

Regarding Claim 37, Meyer discloses The method of claim 36, wherein the specific media comprises CDs. (see Meyer paragraph 013, lines 8-12)

Regarding Claim 38, Meyer discloses The method of claim 36, wherein the specific media comprises DVDs. (see Meyer paragraph 013, lines 8-12)

Regarding Claim 51, Jaeger discloses A system for providing metadata to clients comprising:

a canonical table comprising multiple physical IDs associated with specific media containing content that can be experienced by a user; (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: search a physical ID-logical ID table)

multiple logical IDs associated with the multiple physical IDs; (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: physical Ids mapped to multiple logical IDs table)

individual physical IDs being mapped to individual logical IDs; (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: physical ID mapped to logical ID table) and the logical IDs being configured for use in database queries to locate metadata associated with specific media. (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: physical ID mapped to logical ID table)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Jaeger's teachings of describing table name and its columns/rows as taught in Jaeger. One would have been motivated because the teachings are devoted to relational database application and the combination would have enabled Jaeger's system to utilize Entity-Relation model for establishing business and industrial application database models.

Regarding Claim 52, Jaeger discloses The system of claim 51 further comprising at least one other table containing multiple physical IDs and multiple

logical IDs, individual physical IDs being mapped to individual logical IDs. (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: multiple physical ID-logical ID tables) Referring to claim 52, claim 52 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of the claim 51. Therefore, claim 52 is rejected for the same reason and motivation as the claim 51.

Regarding Claim 53, Jaeger discloses The system of claim 52, wherein the canonical table is trusted. (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: physical ID-logical ID table, first (trusted) table) Referring to claim 53, claim 53 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of the claim 51. Therefore, claim 53 is rejected for the same reason and motivation as the claim 51.

Regarding Claim 54, Jaeger discloses The system of claim 52, wherein the canonical table is trusted, and the at least one other table is less trusted. (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: physical ID-logical ID table, second (less trusted) table) Referring to claim 54, claim 54 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of the claim 51. Therefore, claim 54 is rejected for the same reason and motivation as the claim 51.

Regarding Claim 55, Jaeger discloses The system of claim 52, wherein the at least one other table comprise user-provided mappings. (see Jaeger col. 4, lines 33-46; col. 4, lines 50-56: physical ID-logical ID table, second (user-provided) table) Referring to claim 55, claim 55 encompasses the same scope of the

invention as that of the claim 51. Therefore, claim 55 is rejected for the same reason and motivation as the claim 51.

7. Claims 72-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Milsted** (US Patent No. 6,345,256: Automated method and apparatus top package digital content for electronic distribution using the identity of the source)

Regarding Claim 72, Milsted discloses A method of providing metadata to a client comprising:

establishing a table that contains user-provided entries that map physical IDs to logical IDs, the physical IDs corresponding to specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by various users, the logical IDs being configured for use in querying one or more databases that contain metadata associated with the specific media, the metadata being returnable to a client; statistically evaluating the entries to determine, for each physical ID, a most likely logical ID match; (see Milsted col. 6, lines 34-38 col. 6, lines 42-47; col. 47, lines 47-53: data mining techniques to statistically evaluate most likely physical ID to logical ID match) and making the most likely logical ID match available so that it can be used to query the one or more databases. (see Milsted col. 6, lines 34-38 col. 6, lines 42-47; col. 47, lines 47-53: data mining techniques to determine most likely logical ID match)

Wherein Milsted's statistical collection and processing media content and metadata usage is equivalent to Applicant's generation of statistics based on media content and metadata usage. (see Milsted col. 6, lines 34-38 col. 6, lines 42-47; col. 47, lines 47-53) Milsted's description of data collection parameters (content usage, calculated percentages, data mining techniques) is equivalent to applicant's description of the information collected and processed based on content and metadata usage retrieved from the database. Milsted does disclose data collection and statistics generation, which are created by the usage of standard data mining techniques.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Milsted's teachings describing data collection and processing. One would have been motivated because the teachings are devoted to the generation of statistical parameters, and the combination would have enabled Milsted's system to utilize data mining techniques for establishing business and industrial database applications.

Regarding Claim 73, Milsted discloses The method of claim 72, wherein said making comprises providing the logical ID into a trusted table of physical ID-to-logical ID mappings. (see Milsted col. 6, lines 34-38 col. 6, lines 42-47; col. 47, lines 47-53: data mining techniques to calculate number of times physical ID mapped to logical ID) Referring to claim 73, claim 73 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of the claim 72. Therefore, claim 73 is rejected for the same reason and motivation as the claim 72.

Regarding Claim 74, Milsted discloses A method of providing metadata to a client comprising:

providing a table containing user-provided entries that map physical IDs to logical IDs, the physical IDs corresponding to specific media upon which content resides that can be experienced by various users, the logical IDs being configured for use in querying one or more databases that contain metadata associated with the specific media, the metadata being returnable to a client; computing, from the table, a list of physical IDs that are to be statistically evaluated; (see Milsted col. 6, lines 34-38 col. 6, lines 42-47; col. 47, lines 47-53: data mining techniques to calculate list of physical IDs statistically evaluated)

for each listed physical ID, ascertaining the logical IDs that have been associated with it by users; computing a distribution of logical IDs for a given physical ID, the distribution describing, for each logical ID, the number of times the physical ID has been mapped thereto; (see Milsted col. 6, lines 34-38 col. 6, lines 42-47; col. 47, lines 47-53: data mining techniques to calculate number of times physical ID mapped to logical ID)

adding to the distribution, an entry that corresponds to a current trusted logical ID mapping; weighting the added entry; and computing, from the distribution, a most likely physical ID to logical ID match. (see Milsted col. 6, lines 34-38 col. 6, lines 42-47; col. 47, lines 47-53: data mining techniques to calculate most likely physical ID to logical ID match)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ Milsted's teachings describing data collection and processing. One would have been motivated because the teachings are devoted to the generation of statistical parameters and such a combination would have enabled Milsted's system to utilize data mining techniques for establishing business and industrial database applications.

Regarding Claim 75, Milsted discloses The method of claim 74 further comprising updating a canonical table of trusted mappings with the most likely physical ID to logical ID match. (see Milsted col. 6, lines 34-38 col. 6, lines 42-47; col. 47, lines 47-53: data mining techniques to calculate most likely physical ID to logical ID match) Referring to claim 75, claim 75 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of the claim 74. Therefore, claim 75 is rejected for the same reason and motivation as the claim 74.

Regarding Claim 76, Milsted discloses The method of claim 74, wherein said computing a most likely physical ID to logical ID match comprises:

computing a distribution count that sums the total number of times a physical ID has been mapped to a logical ID; (see Milsted col. 6, lines 34-38 col. 6, lines 42-47; col. 47, lines 47-53: data mining techniques to calculate number of times physical ID mapped to logical ID)

calculating, for each logical ID, a percentage as a function of the summed distribution count; (see Milsted col. 6, lines 34-38 col. 6, lines 42-47; col. 47,

lines 47-53: data mining techniques to calculate percentage for each logical ID) and

selecting a logical ID that has a percentage that meets predefined criteria.

(see Milsted col. 6, lines 34-38 col. 6, lines 42-47; data mining techniques to calculate percentage for each logical ID) Referring to claim 76, claim 76 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of the claim 74.

Therefore, claim 76 is rejected for the same reason and motivation as the claim 74.

Contact Information

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyung H Shin whose telephone number is 703-305-0711. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am - 7 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KHS

Kyung H Shin
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2143

KHS
AUG. 13, 2004

[Handwritten signature of David Wiley]
DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100